

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	Y DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/006,436	11/21/2001	William T. Brown	51013.P005	4170	
25943	7590 10/27/2003		EXAMINER		
	, WILLIAMSON & W ENTER, SUITES 1600-	HANNAHER, C	HANNAHER, CONSTANTINE		
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2878		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2				<b></b>	am			
Office Action Summary		Application No.		pplicant(s)				
		10/006,436		BROWN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Constantine Hann		2878				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-fin	al.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  Disposition of Claims								
· _		,	•					
•	<ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> </ul>							
5) Claim(s) <u>26-36 and 62-72</u> is/are allowed.								
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>20-36 and 62-72</u> is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,25,37 and 61</u> is/are rejected.								
·	Claim(s) <u>2-24 and 38-60</u> is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers	·						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 November 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	<ul> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> </ul>							
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).								
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachment	t(s)							
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	5) 🔲		(PTO-413) Paper No Patent Application (PT				
J.S. Patent and Tr	ademark Office							

Application/Control Number: 10/006,436

Art Unit: 2878

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# **Specification**

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

Page: 2

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Note the use of "In accordance with a first aspect of the present invention" and the like, all of which phrases can be implied.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the provisional application number is missing on pages 3 and 9.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### Claim Objections

- 3. Claim 42 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim does not refer "back to" another claim in accordance with 37 CFR 1.75(c) and will otherwise be treated as if dependent on claim 39. Appropriate correction is required.
- 4. Claim 72 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim does not "further limit" another claim in accordance with 37 CFR 1.75(c) and will otherwise be treated as if dependent on claim 71. Appropriate correction is required.

د

Art Unit: 2878

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1, 25, 37, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Nirmalan et al. (US006422743B1).

With respect to independent claim 1, the disclosure of Nirmalan *et al.* is "in a computing environment" as recited (computer 101) of an automated turbine component 24 thermal response analysis method corresponding to the illustrated apparatus (Fig. 7) and work product (Fig. 6). The method would comprise the steps of selecting a region of interest (*e.g.*, suction side leading edge of Fig. 6C), determining for the selected region of interest whether one or more thermal response metrics (convective heat transfer coefficient  $\lambda$ ) are within one or more corresponding acceptance ranges (master data, column 7, line 5 to column 8, line 5) and, if there is more than one region of interest (*e.g.*, pressure surface, Fig. 6B), repeating the selecting and determining steps.

With respect to dependent claim 25, the assessment of worthiness described by Nirmalan *et al.* at column 7, lines 5-6 necessarily includes deciding whether the turbine component **24** should be considered as having passed or failed the "manufacturing inspection" (column 7, line 11).

With respect to independent claim 37, Nirmalan et al. discloses an apparatus (Fig. 7) comprising at least one storage unit and at least one processor coupled thereto (computer 101). The programming stored therein is as recited (see the rejection of claim 1).

Application/Control Number: 10/006,436

Art Unit: 2878

With respect to dependent claim 61, the programming stored in the computer 101 of

Page: 4

Nirmalan et al. is as recited (see the rejection of claim 25).

# Response to Submission(s)

7. The papers filed on February 1, 2002 (certificate of mailing dated January 14, 2002) have not been made part of the permanent records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) for this application (37 CFR 1.52(a)) because of damage from the United States Postal Service irradiation process. The above-identified papers, however, were not so damaged as to preclude the USPTO from making a legible copy of such papers. Therefore, the Office has made a copy of these papers, substituted them for the originals in the file, and stamped that copy:

# COPY OF PAPERS ORIGINALLY FILED

If applicant wants to review the accuracy of the Office's copy of such papers, applicant may either inspect the application (37 CFR 1.14(d)) or may request a copy of the Office's records of such papers (i.e., a copy of the copy made by the Office) from the Office of Public Records for the fee specified in 37 CFR 1.19(b)(4). Please do **not** call the Technology Center's Customer Service Center to inquiry about the completeness or accuracy of Office's copy of the above-identified papers, as the Technology Center's Customer Service Center will **not** be able to provide this service.

If applicant does not consider the Office's copy of such papers to be accurate, applicant must provide a copy of the above-identified papers (except for any U.S. or foreign patent documents submitted with the above-identified papers) with a statement that such copy is a complete and accurate copy of the originally submitted documents. If applicant provides such a copy of the above-identified papers and statement within **THREE MONTHS** of the mail date of this Office action, the Office will add the original mailroom date and use the copy provided by applicant as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers in place of the copy made by the Office. Otherwise, the Office's copy will be used as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers (*i.e.*, the Office will use the copy of the above-identified papers made by the Office for examination and all other purposes). This three-month period is not extendable.

# Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 26-36 and 62-72 are allowed.

العر

9. Claims 2-24 and 38-60 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the analysis of Nirmalan *et al.* does not suggest any of the determining steps of dependent claims 2, 9, 16, 38, 45, and 52, or of independent claims 26, 33, 62, and 69.

#### Conclusion

- 11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Matoba *et al.* (US004983836A) discloses determination of the extent of a thinned out portion of a pipe.
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Constantine Hannaher whose telephone number is (703) 308-4850. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with flexible hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (703) 308-4852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Constantine Hannaher
Primary Examiner

ch